

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. CR 13cr2460 RB

JESUS-ALBERTO-CORONADO,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on five notices Defendant filed on June 1, 2020: (1) Notice Requiring the Right to Invoke the Laws of the Republic (Common Law) Under Article IV Section IV of the Constitution of the United States of America (Doc. 78); (2) Notice Require¹ and Demand Validation of Oath of Office (Doc. 79); (3) Notice to Require Corpus De'licti (Doc. 80); (4) Notice to Require Discharge of 13-CR-2460 RB (Doc. 81); and (5) Notice to Require and Demand Anti-Bribery Statement and Foreign Registration Statement (Doc. 82). The United States responded on June 15, 2020. (Doc. 89.) Having reviewed the arguments and the applicable law, the Court will construe the notices as motions, find that they are not well-taken, and deny them without a hearing.

I. Procedural History

On June 26, 2014, Mr. Coronado was sentenced to 63 months incarceration followed by three years of supervised release. (Docs. 54; 55.) He began his term of supervised release on February 1, 2018. (*See* Doc. 89 at 1.) On January 6, 2020, Mr. Coronado was arrested based on violations of his supervised release terms. (*See* Docs. 62; 64.) The Court appointed counsel for Mr. Coronado, but he chose to proceed pro se beginning on May 21, 2020. (*See* Docs. 73; 76.)

¹ All grammatical and spelling errors are original to the notices cited.

Mr. Coronado filed five notices on June 1, 2020. (Docs. 78–82.) On June 3, 2020, Senior United States Probation Officer David Banegas filed an Amended Petition for Revocation of Supervised Release, alleging that Mr. Coronado violated another condition of his supervised release: that he “shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime.” (Doc. 83 at 1.)

II. Analysis

In his first notice, Mr. Coronado asserts that the United States has neither offered a “sworn statement” nor “been present at any of the hearings” in this matter. (Doc. 78 at 3.) He asks the Court to dismiss the charges against him and restore his rights and property. (*Id.* at 4.) As the Government notes, however, the Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision (Doc. 60) and the Amended Petition (Doc. 83) provide all necessary notice. (*See* Doc. 89 at 3.) The Government has also verified that it “will have a witness available to testify as to the allegations set forth in these petitions.” (*Id.*) Accordingly, the Court will deny the first notice.

In his second notice, Mr. Coronado asks that the undersigned, counsel for the United States, Mr. Benegas, and the Clerk of the Court “to place, on the record, . . . [his or her] Oath of Office[.]” and that each of these individuals “act on [his or her] Oath . . . [to] protect [his] inalienable, God given rights.” (Doc. 79 at 2.) Mr. Coronado may find this information in a public records search. *See, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 453 (Oaths of justices and judges of the United States), 544 (Oath of office for United States attorney and assistant United States attorneys), 951 (Oath of office of clerks and deputies); 5 U.S.C. § 3331 (Oath of office for individuals “elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services”). Further, as requested by counsel for the United States, the Court takes judicial notice that Ms. Maria Armijo is a member of the Federal bar and is an Assistant United States District Attorney. (*See* Doc. 89 at 3.) The Court denies the second notice.

In his third notice, Mr. Coronado asks that the Government be made to provide notice of the charges and alleges that the United States has not been present at any of the hearings in this matter. (Doc. 80 at 2.) Again, the Court points Mr. Coronado to the Petition and Amended Petition. (Docs. 60; 83.) This notice will be denied.

In his fourth notice, Mr. Coronado asserts that the United States is a for-profit corporation and/or a “fictitious plaintiff” without authority over him and asks the Court to dismiss the charges against him. (Doc. 81 at 1–2.) He alleges that counsel for the United States has committed a fraud against him and/or contempt of court. (*Id.* at 2.) He asks the Court to dismiss the charges against him. (*Id.* at 3.) These allegations are without merit and will be denied.

In his fifth notice, he demands that Ms. Armijo, Mr. Benagas, and “Any other Public Official who has participated in” this action immediately “enter on the record . . . Your Anti-Bribery Statement as well as your Foreign Agents Registration Statement.” (Doc. 82 at 1.) Mr. Coronado cites no basis in law or fact for this motion, and the Court will deny it.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that Mr. Coronado’s notices (Docs. 78–82) are **DENIED**.



ROBERT C. BRACK
SENIOR U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE